## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

OLLIE GREENE, Individually as the § § surviving parent of WYNDELL GREENE, SR., WILLIAM GREENE, as the § Administrator of the Estate of WYNDELL § GREENE, SR., and MARILYN BURDETTE § HARDEMAN, Individually and as the § § CAUSE NUMBER: 3:11-cv-0207-N surviving parent of LAKEYSHA GREENE, § Plaintiffs, § v. § § § **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED** TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION, TOYOTA MOTOR ENGINEERING & § MANUFACTURING NORTH AMERICA, **§** § § § § INC., TOYOTA MOTOR SALES USA, INC., VOLVO GROUP NORTH AMERICA, LLC., VOLVO TRUCKS NORTH AMERICA, A DIVISION OF **VOLVO GROUP NORTH AMERICA,** 88888 LLC., STRICK TRAILERS, LLC, JOHN FAYARD MOVING & WAREHOUSE, LLC, and DOLPHIN LINE, INC. Defendants.

## PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT JOHN FAYARD MOVING & WAREHOUSE, LLC'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

## TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

Ollie Greene, Individually and as parent of Wyndell Greene, Sr., William Greene, as Administrator of the Estate of Wyndell Greene, Sr. and Marilyn Burdette Hardeman, Individually and the parent of LaKeysha Greene (collectively "Plaintiffs") file this Response to John Fayard Moving & Warehouse, LLC.'s ("Fayard") Motion for Summary Judgment and show the Court as follows:

Procedurally, the Court should strike and/or dismiss the Fayard's motion for summary judgment since it violates Local Rule 56.3(d). In addition, the Court should strike and/or dismiss

PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT – Page 1 Fayard's Motion for Summary Judgment pursuant to the Motion for Sanctions for Spoliation of Evidence filed by Plaintiffs. Moreover, as demonstrated in Plaintiffs' Brief in Opposition to Fayard's motion for summary judgment, Fayard is not entitled to summary judgment on any of the claims asserted by Plaintiffs. For the reasons set forth in Plaintiffs' Response and Brief in Opposition to Fayard's Motion for Summary Judgment, summary judgment in favor of Fayard is not appropriate since Plaintiffs have evidence of the elements of each cause of action and the law does not provide that Fayard is entitled to the relief sought in Fayard's Motion for Summary Judgment.

Therefore, Plaintiffs pray that Fayard's Motion for Summary Judgment be denied in their entirety and that Plaintiffs be granted all relief, at law and in equity, to which they are entitled.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Aubrey "Nick" Pittman AUBREY "NICK" PITTMAN State Bar No. 16049750

THE PITTMAN LAW FIRM, P.C. 100 Crescent Court, Suite 700 Dallas, Texas 75201-2112 214-459-3454 214-853-5912 – fax pittman@thepittmanlawfirm.com

/s/ Daryl K. Washington
DARYL K. WASHINGTON
State Bar No. 24013714

LAW OFFICES OF DARYL K. WASHINGTON P.C.
325 N. St. Paul St., Suite 1975
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-880-4883
469-718-0380 - fax
dwashington@dwashlawfirm.com

Case 3:11-cv-00207-N-BH Document 312 Filed 12/31/13 Page 3 of 3 PageID 11303

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 

I hereby certify that on December 31, 2013 the foregoing pleading was filed with the

clerk of the court for the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Texas, using the electronic case

filing system of the court. The electronic case filing system sent a "Notice of Electronic Filing"

to all attorneys of record who have consented in writing to accept this Notice as service of

documents by electronic means.

/s/ Aubrey "Nick" Pittman

AUBREY "NICK" PITTMAN